

BEFORE THE BOARD OF OIL, GAS AND MINING  
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
IN AND FOR THE STATE OF UTAH


---ooOoo---

DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING,	:	RESPONSE
PETITIONER	:	
VS.	:	DOCKET NO. 84-040
	:	CAUSE NO. ACT/015/025
CO-OP MINING COMPANY,	:	
RESPONDENT	:	

---ooOoo---

Attached is the response prepared by the Division staff to the June 25, 1984 submittal from Co-Op Mining Company concerning the Bear Canyon Mine, ACT/015/025, #2, Emery County, Utah.

Copies of this response have been hand-delivered to Kenneth L. Rothey and Carl E. Kingston, representing Co-Op Mining Company.

  
Dianne R. Nielson, Director  
Division of Oil, Gas and Mining





July 13, 1984

TO: Dianne R. Nielson, Director

FROM: Mary M. Boucek, Permit Supervisor/Reclamation Biologist *MMB*

RE: Incomplete Response - Co-op Mining Company, Bear Canyon Mine, ACT/015/025, #2, Emery County, Utah

The technical staff has completed its review of the June 25, 1984 submittal regarding the mining and reclamation plan referenced above. The following outlines the completeness status of the applicant's response to each regulation as enumerated in the March 1984 Determination of Completeness/Technical Deficiency (DOC/TD) document and subsequently in the May 11, 1984 Memorandum, M. Boucek to D. Nielson. It should be noted that the following reflects a completeness review, not a technical review, and consequently does not address technical deficiencies under the performance standards of the permanent program. Rather than reiterate all regulations where the applicant has supplied complete information, this synopsis concentrates on those areas where the applicant has not supplied complete information in order to proceed into the Technical Analysis phase of the review process.

UMC 783.15 Ground Water Information

The applicant has identified a regional aquifer within and adjacent to the proposed mine plan area (MRP, Chapter 7, page 5). Moreover, the applicant states that the aquifer is the source for Bear Spring (Huntington municipal water source) and most of the large perennial springs in the vicinity (MRP, Chapter 7, page 5).

The applicant has not provided ground water/aquifer information as required by UMC 783.15 and requested in previous Division DOC documents. UMC 783.15 is determined to be incomplete.

UMC 783.24 Maps: General Requirements

The applicant has provided maps which designate contradictory permit boundaries. As a consequence, the permit area has not been defined. UMC 783.24(b) and (c) have not been satisfactorily addressed and are determined to be incomplete.



Page Two  
Memorandum - Dianne R. Nielson, Director  
July 13, 1984

Requirements under this regulation were determined to have been unsatisfactorily addressed by the applicant and were so addressed in the Division's March 30, 1984 DOC/TD document. The inconsistency in permit area boundaries was not brought to light in the May 11, 1984 Division Memorandum (M. Boucek to D. Nielson) and was detected during the staff's mandated review of the June 25, 1984 submittal by Co-op.

UMC 783.24 Cross-Sections, Maps and Plans

The applicant has not provided maps or plans that show the location and extent of known underground mines within the proposed mine plan and adjacent areas. UMC 783.25(e) has not been satisfactorily addressed and is determined to be incomplete.

Requirements under this regulation were determined to have been unsatisfactorily addressed by the applicant and were so addressed in the Division's March 30, 1984 DOC/TD document. Failure to show the location and extent of known underground mines within the proposed mine plan and adjacent areas was not brought to light in the May 11, 1984 Division Memorandum (M. Boucek to D. Nielson) and was detected during the staff's mandated review of the June 25, 1984 submittal by Co-op.

UMC 784.13(b)(4)

It has been determined that 8,100 cubic yards (yd<sup>3</sup>) of suitable topsoil substitute material are needed for reclamation. The applicant has stockpiled 2,600 yd<sup>3</sup>, and has submitted analytical data which indicate that this material is suitable for its intended use. However, the remaining 5,400 yd<sup>3</sup> required for reclamation have not been identified as to source nor have the results of analytical data for this material been submitted, as has been previously requested by the Division. Therefore, UMC 784.13(b)(4) is determined to be incomplete.

UMC 784.20 Subsidence Control Plan

The renewable resource survey submitted on June 28, 1984 does not include a survey of aquifers and areas for the recharge of aquifers and other underground waters or an assessment of the potential subsidence damage or diminution of these renewable resource lands. Upon submission of this required information, the Division will be able to determine the status of renewable resource lands and evaluate whether the MRP should contain a subsidence control plan as described under sections (a), (b) and (c) of UMC 784.20 Therefore, UMC 784.20 is determined to be incomplete.



Page Three  
Memorandum - Dianne R. Nielson, Director  
July 13, 1984

Addendum

During the Division's review of the June 25, 1984 submittal and prior submittals by Co-op, it has been discovered that the applicant has not completely addressed the requirements of UMC 771.23 Permit Application: General Requirements for Format and Contents.

The applicant has not provided information about the persons or organizations that collected and analyzed data given in the MRP, Chapter 6, Geology. UMC 771.23(c) and (d) are not satisfactorily addressed and are determined to be incomplete.

This incompleteness was not brought to light in the March 30, 1984 DOC/TD document, nor was it included in the May 11, 1984 Division Memorandum (M. Boucek to D. Nielson). Therefore, it is considered to be a new area of incompleteness.

MMB/btb

cc: Barbara Roberts, Attorney General's Office3  
Ron Daniels, DOGM  
Jim Smith, DOGM  
Steve Cox, DOGM  
Pam Grubaugh-Littig, DOGM  
Ev Hooper, DOGM  
Tom Munson, DOGM  
Rick Smith, DOGM  
John Whitehead, DOGM  
88340-20-22